

Docket No. CE11375R

**REMARKS**

Claim 1-6 and 8-34 are cancelled. Claims 7 and 35 remain in the application. The actions taken are in the interest of expediting prosecution and with no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. Moreover, the amendment or cancellation of claims herein is without prejudice to pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0134655) in view of Terry (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0116125). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Terry in further view of well known art. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Terry and in further view of Kitazawa (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0037729). Claims 9-13 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Terry and Kitazawa and well known art. Claims 23 is rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sinnarajah et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0203336) in view of Yano and Chen. Claims 27 and 31-34 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sinnarajah in view of McGowan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0106423). Claims 28-30 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sinnarajah in view of McGowan in further view of Chen. Claims 1-6 and 8-34 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

**Allowable Claims**

Claims 7 and 35 are allowed.

Docket No. CE11375R

Prior Art

The references cited but not relied upon are believed not to anticipate or make obvious Applicants' invention.

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 3-28-06  
SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3rd  
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196  
Customer Number: 23330

By:

Kevin D. Wills  
Kevin D. Wills  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 43,993  
Telephone: 480-732-5364  
Fax No.: 480-732-2402  
Email: Kevin.Wills@motorola.com